



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

VOL. XXXIV, 4.

WHOLE NO. 136.

I.—THE CREATION OF THE TRIBE PTOLEMAIS AT ATHENS.¹

Neither the date of the establishment of the tribe Ptolemais at Athens nor the motive prompting its creation is recorded by any ancient historian. From other writers of antiquity very little evidence can be gleaned, and all of it is untrustworthy. The traveller Pausanias asserts that Ptolemaios Philadelphos was the eponymous hero of the tribe (I. 5, 5; 6, 8; 8, 6). This might lead us to infer that Ptolemais was created before his death in 247 B. C. Inscriptions prove, however, that there were only twelve prytanizing tribes at Athens during his lifetime, and since Athens was under Macedonian influence from 262 to 232, it is clear that Ptolemais was not created during the reign of Ptole-

¹ This study was undertaken while I was holding a research fellowship from the Carnegie Institution in the American School of Classical Studies at Athens. I wish to express my obligations to those who made possible my work at Athens, as well as to Mr. Hill, the Director of the School, to Mr. Leonardos, then Ephor of the Epigraphical Section of the National Museum at Athens, who kindly gave me every opportunity for studying the inscriptions, and to Professor Capps, of Princeton, who has read the manuscript and offered many valuable suggestions.

While I was correcting the proof of this article I received Kirchner's revised edition of the *Inscriptiones Graecae* Vol. II and III (IG. Vol. II and III, edit. min. pars I, fasc. 1). This edition with its large number of new readings, new inscriptions and vastly improved arrangement will so soon supersede the old volumes, that I have added references wherever possible in accord with the new numbering. I have denoted the new edition as K. and such a reference as K. 791 (II. 334) means number 791 in the new volume, or IG. II. 334 according to the older edition.

maios Philadelphos. One other reference to Ptolemais is found in an epigram of Kallimachos (Anth. Pal., VII. 520) who died about 240 B. C. The poet is alluding, however, to a tribe of that name known to exist in Alexandria (Westermann, *βιογραφίαι*, p. 50; Beloch, *Die Errichtung der Phyle Ptolemais*, *Fleckeisen's Jahrb. f. cl. Phil.*, 1884, 481 ff.; Bates, *The Five Post-Kleisthenean Tribes*, *Cornell Studies VIII*, 1898, 29-30). Neither of these passages, therefore, can be used to prove the existence of Ptolemais at Athens before 232 B. C. Pausanias may be right in claiming that Ptolemaios Philadelphos was the eponymous hero, but it is certain that the new tribe was not created during his reign.

The only positive evidence as to the date of the establishment of Ptolemais has been stated by Beloch (loc. cit., cf. *Gr. Gesch.*, III. 2. 56-7) as follows: Since the deme Berenikidai was created along with the tribe Ptolemais, and since Berenike, in whose honor the deme was established, was the wife of Ptolemaios Euergetes (Stephanus, s. v. *Βερενικίδαι*), he was therefore the eponymous hero and the tribe must have been created during his reign (247-222). Beloch then observed that the thesmothetai in IG. II. 859 are recorded in the official order of the twelve tribes up to the archonship of Niketes; are disarranged in the year of Antiphilos (probably due to error of the mason), and in the archonship of Menekrates are in the official order of the thirteen tribes. Hence he argued that Ptolemais was established between the archonships of Niketes and Menekrates. Kirchner (GGA. 1900. 450) following the suggestion of Schebelew (quoted by Kirchner, loc. cit.) noted further that the archon Antiphilos was from the deme Aphidna (II. 859, l. 53), which was assigned to Ptolemais when the new tribe was formed. He was thus led to infer that Ptolemais was established in that year, and as a compliment to Ptolemy, the archonship was given to Ptolemais. This date (224/3) has been accepted universally (Ferguson, *Priests of Asklepios*, p. 158; Maltezos, *Ἀρχ. Ἐφ.*, 1907-8, pp. 295-6; Kolbe, *Die Attischen Archonten* 47, *Abhandl. d. königl. Gesells. d. Wissens. z. Göttingen X*, n. 4; cf. Ferguson, *Hellenistic Athens*, 243-4).

This argument for the creation of Ptolemais is based on the evidence furnished by the lists of thesmothetai in IG. II. 859, and is valid only if Beloch's estimation of their value is sustained.

Let us examine these lists more closely. In the first place, Beloch himself noted the stonecutter's error in the list for the archonship of Antiphilos. There may be a second error in Menekrates' year, unless we assume that Anakaia was transferred in part to Demetrias, for which there is no other evidence (Kirchner, *Rh. Mus.* 1892, 550 ff.; Bates, *op. cit.*, p. 23). There is the possibility of still another error, i. e., the thesmothetes from Phlya in the archonship of Niketes may be misplaced. If we assume this provisionally, then the thesmothetai throughout the whole list in IG. II. 859 are arranged in the official order of the *thirteen* tribes, if we except the mistakes made by the stonecutter. In that case this inscription proves only that Ptolemais was in existence already in 229 B. C., while we are still no nearer a determination of the date of its creation. In view of the fact that there is certainly one stonecutter's error, probably two, and possibly three in IG. II. 859, the testimony of the lists of thesmothetai must be used with extreme caution, and it is clear that their evidence must no longer be regarded as decisive in establishing the date of the creation of Ptolemais.

Instead of assuming that Phlya is out of place in the list of thesmothetai under Niketes, it is quite possible that this was a divided deme, and that a part remained with its old tribe Kekropis. If IG. II. 859 can be used to prove that Anakaia was a member of two tribes (Kirchner, *loc. cit.*), the same argument may be used in regard to Phlya with equal cogency. Ptolemais was given twenty-four demes when the tribe was established, while Antigonis and Demetrias apparently did not have more than ten, possibly less. There is no plausible explanation of this, unless many of the demes assigned to Ptolemais were small or divided demes, but, as a matter of fact, we only know of one divided between the old and the new tribe (Bates, *op. cit.* 45). Many more may have been divided, at least for a time, but we are ignorant of the exact facts because the evidence is so meagre.

IG. II. 859 is the only document which gives any evidence about the position of Phlya for the remainder of the third century, after the creation of Ptolemais. No inscriptions exist in the second century before 129 B. C. which indicate in any way to which tribe it belonged. After 129 all the evidence tends to prove that Phlya was assigned to Ptolemais only (Bates, *op. cit.*, pp. 35-6).

If the accepted interpretation of IG. II. 859 is questioned, it cannot be used as heretofore to determine the date of the creation of Ptolemais. All that can be determined from this inscription is that Ptolemais *may* have existed before the year 229/8. Other sources must be sought and investigated. One method of proof which has not hitherto been fully exploited remains. If we study the extant decrees belonging to the period between 233/2, when only twelve tribes existed [Archon Ther-silochos K. 778 (II. 308), 780 (II. 307), 781 (II. 5, 307b), and 220/19, when thirteen tribes shared the prytanies (cf. IG. II. 403), we may be able, by observing the relation of the prytany to the calendar month, to determine how many tribes were officiating in the government of that year. In this way we may be able to approximate more nearly the date of the establishment of the new tribe.

The inscriptions which concern us most in this study are as follows: K. 791 (IG. II. 334, Archon Diomedon, generally dated in 232/1); K. 783 (II. 5. 373 c, probably dated in the archonship of . . . βιος, and from the cycle assigned to 230/29); II. 384, II. 5. 385 b, 385 c (these three inscriptions are generally assigned to the same archon Heliodoros and dated in 229/8); II. 5. 381 b (Archon Theophilos and dated in 227/6); II. 381 (Archon Ergochares, 226/5).

K. 791 (II. 334) and IG. II. 381 have been discussed recently by Kirchner (Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1910, p. 985 ff.), who regards them as examples of double dating. It is to be observed however that, when the double system is used, there is always a phrase, *κατὰ θεόν, κατ' ἀρχοντα* or *ἡμερολογεῖδόν* indicating such a system, while these inscriptions lack any such formula. This in itself would make it extremely doubtful if the double system should be applied to them, and when we consider these decrees in detail we shall take up other objections.

The restoration of K. 791 (II. 334) is not difficult as it is written *στοιχηδόν*, and the maximum number of letters in a line is 48, though some (9, 12, 15, 19, 20, 22, 25) are shorter. In most cases this is due to leaving a blank space for punctuation (12, 15, 19, 20, 23, 25-?), but line 11 has only 47 letters, with no possibility of a space for punctuation, and line 12 has 46 letters, with one space only left for punctuation. It is clear, therefore,

that in making our restoration we must allow for lines of either 47 or 48 letters. The following restoration is proposed :

[ἐ]πὶ Διομέδοντος ἄρχοντος ἐπὶ τῆς [Δημητριάδος δεκάτης πρυτανείας ἢ Φορυσκίδης Ἀριστομένου Ἀ[. ἐγραμμά-]
[τε]υεν; ¹ Ἐλαφηβολιώωνος ἔνει καὶ νέαι ἐμ[βολίμωι, εἰκοστῇ τ-]
[ῆς] πρυτανείας κτλ.

The restoration of the prytanizing tribe in the first line must be either Ἀντιγονίδος or Δημητριάδος as these tribal names alone suffered erasure. If Antigonis is the prytanizing tribe in the 6th prytany, as is restored in IG. II. 836, we must restore Δημητριάδος here. The word δεκάτης gives a line of 48 letters and is undoubtedly correct. ἐνάτης would give a line of 47 letters and affords insuperable difficulties in explaining the arrangement of the prytanies.

The restoration of line 2 must be left for discussion until after the restoration of lines 3 and 4 is discussed. The restoration of the day of the prytany in line 3 is dependent upon the length of the line. If this is a line of 48 letters we can restore δευτέρα, τετάρτη or εἰκοστῇ; if of 47 letters, πέμπτη, ἑβδόμη or δεκάτῃ. The ἐμβόλιμος day of Elaphebolion was the 266th day of the year. Kirchner (K. 791 or II. 334) restores δεκάτης in line 1 and δευτέραι in line 3. If this is an ordinary year which begins with a month of 29 days and if we give 29 days to the first six prytanies, and 30 to the remainder, then the second day of the tenth prytany falls on the thirtieth of Elaphebolion. There is however still another possibility. If we restore in line 3 [εἰκοστῇ τῇ]ς πρυτανείας, we get the following equation for the scheme of the prytanies in the time of the thirteen tribes when, in an ordinary year, there were thirteen prytanies of 27 days and the three extra days ($13 \times 27 + 3 = 354$ days) were divided up amongst the first three prytanies; 9×27 (days in regular prytany) + 3 (extra days added probably to first three prytanies) + 20 (20th day of 10th prytany) = 266th day of the year. This combination gives a simple and logical explanation of the prytany scheme. No other combination of the other restorations suggested is satisfactory. The solution which we have offered is simple enough, if the existence of the thirteen tribes is granted for that year. If we turn to the restoration of line 2, we shall see that we are forced to

¹ One space was left vacant for punctuation after [ἐγραμμάτε]υεν.

assume that Ptolemais is in existence. Otherwise there is no possibility of placing this secretary in the established cycle.

In the second line the name of the deme begins with Λ as is published by Koehler in the IG. The reading Λ was suggested by Wilhelm,¹ (*Ἀρχ.*, 1892, p. 139, note). In the accompanying photograph (which is taken from a squeeze of the upper part of K. 791 (II. 334) the cross bar of the letter *alpha* may readily be seen. From an examination of the stone itself, it is quite clear that the line is not a flaw but the original chiseling of the stonecutter. Wilhelm offered this reading only as a possibility while studying some Euboean inscriptions where the name $\Phi\acute{o}\rho\upsilon\varsigma$ suggested the restoration $[\Phi\acute{o}\rho\upsilon]\sigma\kappa\omicron\varsigma$ $\Delta\epsilon\upsilon\kappa$. in a late Attic inscription (though $[\Delta\upsilon\kappa\acute{\iota}]\sigma\kappa\omicron\varsigma$ is equally probable). From this he suggested the reading $\Phi\omicron\rho\upsilon\sigma\kappa\acute{\iota}\delta\eta\varsigma$ $\text{'}\text{Αριστομένου Λευκονοεύς}$ in K. 791 (II. 334), but the chain of reasoning by which this result is obtained is not always clear or convincing, and his argument is not strengthened by an examination of the stone itself. Any restoration of this inscription must therefore be made on the basis of Koehler's reading. If we reconstruct line 2 with 48 letters we have the following possibilities: $\text{'}\text{Αλιμούσιος}$ (Leontis), $\text{'}\text{Αμαξαντεύς}$ or $\text{'}\text{Αμυμωνεύς}$ (Hippothontis) or, $\text{'}\text{Αλωπεκῆθεν}$ (Antiochis). If we allow however the possibility of this line being one letter short of the maximum, as we have shown to be occasionally the case, we must then consider the following possibilities: $\text{'}\text{Αγκυλῆθεν}$, $\text{'}\text{Αραφήμιος}$ (Aigeis), $\text{'}\text{Αγγελῆθεν}$ (Pandionis), $\text{'}\text{Αγνούσιος}$ (Akamantis), $\text{'}\text{Ανακαιεύς}$ (Hippothontis), $\text{'}\text{Αφιδναῖος}$ (Aiantis, or Ptolemais), $\text{'}\text{Αἰγυλιεύς}$ (Antiochis or Ptolemais), $\text{'}\text{Αγρυλῆθεν}$, $\text{'}\text{Αἰθαλίδης}$ (Antigonis). We shall see later that we must restore $\text{'}\text{Αγνούσιος}$ and assume that this line had only 47 letters.

If we turn now to the next datable inscription of this period we have undoubted evidence for the existence of thirteen prytanies. This is K. 783 (II. 5, 373c), which Ferguson has dated from the secretary-cycle in 230/29 (Priests of Asklepios, p. 134). Lines 1-4 are to be restored as follows:

[ἐπ. . . βίου ἄρχ]οντος ἐπὶ τῆς Αἰαντίδος δωδεκάτης πρυτανείας ἥ
[.....]νωνος Ἐπικηφίσιος ἐγραμμάτευεν. βουλῆς ψηφίσματα
[Θαργηλιῶ]νος ὀγδοεὶ μετ' εἰκάδας, τρίτει καὶ εἰκοστῇ, τῆς πρυτανείας.

¹ Kirchner (GGA. 1900, 448) refers to Lolling, *Δελτ.* ἄρχ., 1892, 48 for this reading.



K. 791 (Il. 334).

The editors in the IG. have restored the month [Σκιροφοριῶ]νος in line 3. This makes the 23rd day of the 12th prytany fall on the 28th day of the 12th month, for which there is no parallel in the Attic inscriptions in any period. The restoration should be [Θαργηλιῶ]νος for, although the writing is not στοιχηδόν, yet the number of letters in the first three lines is nearly uniform if we make this restoration in line 3. The arrangement of the prytanies is thus simplified. The 28th of Thargelion is the 323rd day of the year. In an ordinary year of thirteen prytanies we get the following equation: $11 \times 27 + 3 + 23 = 323$. This inscription therefore gives clear proof that there were thirteen tribes in existence when it was passed. It is equally certain that this decree must be dated in the year 230/29. The other dates to which a secretary from Epikhephisia could be assigned in the time of the thirteen tribes are 217/6 and 204/3. In 217/6 Archelaos was archon, and in his archonship the month Anthesterion was intercalated (IG. II. 5. 385c); so this is excluded. In 204/3 Nikophon or Dionysios was archon and either name is too long to be restored in K. 783 (II. 5. 373c). Archelaos and Dionysios cannot be shifted;¹ so this inscription must be dated in 230/29. Ptolemais must, therefore, have been in existence before this decree was passed.

Our first real difficulty occurs when we come to consider the inscriptions grouped under Heliodoros and all dated by Ferguson and Kirchner in 229/8. Beloch dates these in 231/0 (Gr. Gesch., III. 2. 61). Kolbe (op. cit., p. 50 ff.) distinguishes two archons of this name and dates IG. II. 384, and II. 5. 385b in 229/8, and Heliodoros II (cf. IG. II. 5. 385c) in 217/6. Kirchner rejects this theory (BPW. 1909, p. 850), referring to his review of Ferguson's Athenian Archons in GGA. 1900, p. 452 for his reasons. Ferguson also refuses to accept Kolbe's theory (Hellenistic Athens, p. 209, n. 3). We must consider these inscriptions most carefully, for if they are dated in 229/8 they prove beyond a doubt that Ptolemais could not have existed in that year. This is clear not only from the arrangement of the prytany

¹ This is now perhaps open to question since Kirchner has placed Antimachos (K. 768, 769) in the first half of the century, leaving the years 209/8–207/6 unoccupied. I still think however that Nikophon and Dionysios must remain in the place to which they have been assigned. If so, K. 783 can not be placed in the year 204/3 because the name of the archon can not have more than 7 (or 8 if the name begins with a vowel) letters.

but also from the list of *prytaneis* in IG. II. 5. 385b. We thus have a most unusual state of affairs, and we are compelled to infer that Ptolemais was created only to be temporarily disbanded and later re-established, or else we must reconsider these documents and determine whether they have been correctly dated in 229/8 or not.

There is not the slightest doubt that IG. II. 384 and II. 5. 385b belong to the same archon and year. The former of these inscriptions is so broken that we can infer little from the context. It is certain, however, that βασιλεὺς 'A . . is referred to and apparently in some connection with the Aetolians. Since the name of the king has not been erased, all scholars have agreed in referring this to king Attalos and not Antigonos. The widespread belief that all records of the Macedonian kings or the royal tribes were erased is due to the statement of Livy (XXXI. 44; cf. Dion Chrys., 37. 41), that after the creation of Attalis all such records were excised, and that in other ways the Athenians indulged in their anger against Philip. But the statement of Livy is not borne out by the facts, as an examination of the decrees shows. The following decrees have the name of the king or the royal tribes erased: K. 665 (II. 316), 677 (II. 5. 371b), 681 (II. 324), 682 (II. 331), 766 (II. 338), 775 (II. add. 373b), 780 (II. 307), 781 (II. 5. 307b), 790, 791 (II. 334), 798 (II. 5. 373g), I. G. II. 5. 614b. The following inscriptions have the name of the royal tribes or king still remaining: K. 458 (II. add. 320b), 466 (II. 239), 469 (II. 266), 470 (II. 246; 253), 471 (II. 247), 477 (II. 238), 478 (II. 5. 251b), 480 (II. 5. 252d), 484 (II. 5. 256c) 486, 491 (II. 261), 492 (II. 5. 264c; II. 268), 495 (II. 263), 498 (II. 5. 264d), 507, 555 (II. 251), 558 (243), 559 (II. 419), 560 (II. 265), 561 (II. 267), 562, 563, 641 (II. 297), 646 (II. 300), 647, 653 (II. 311), 657 (II. 314; II. 5. 314), 658 (II. add. 314b), 660 (II. 5. 345c), 666 (II. 317), 679 (II. 322), 685 (II. 5. 331c), 743 (II. 352), 772 (II. add. 352b), 776 (II. 374), 777 (II. 306), 784, 797 (II. add. 252b). There are twelve inscriptions (including one doubtful case, K. 708) in which the names were excised, while in thirty-eight they were left undisturbed. Those in charge of the work of excision do not seem to have been guided by any particular rule. But in general those decrees containing lists of ephebes, and those recording sacrifices to the kings were defaced. The work of excising the names was confined almost without exception, however, to the Akropolis

and preferably to ephebic lists and those decrees recording sacrifices to the kings. We might therefore infer that the work was confined to certain precincts on the Akropolis where such inscriptions were set up, and that in other precincts the work was more perfunctorily done.

With these figures in view, we certainly cannot argue that βασιλέως 'A . . in II. 384 must refer to king Attalos. Further, if we date this inscription in 229/8, it is very doubtful if it can refer to Attalos, because it must still be proven that he had the royal title in that year. The balance of evidence is against it. According to Polybius (XVIII. 41. 7) he first declared himself king after his victory over the Galatians (cf. Livy, 33. 21; Strabo, XIII. 624). Polybius goes on to say: He lived 72 years of which he held the throne for 44 (τούτων δὲ βασιλεύσας κτλ.). Wilcken¹ uses this to prove that he took the title of king in 241 B. C., since he died in 197. This means therefore that he took the title of king in the first year of his command over Pergamon, and requires us to place the victory over the Gauls in the same year. Cardinali², however, (*Studi di Storia Antica* 5, Il Regno di Pergamo, pages 17-48) discusses the whole question and identifies the Gallic war with the campaign against Antiochos Hierax in 230-28 as dated by Eusebius (Schöne, Eusebius, *Chronic.*, p. 253). According to the chronology of Eusebius, Antiochos and the Gauls were finally defeated in the first year of the 138th Olympiad or 228/7. In that case Attalos assumed the royal title after this date and IG. II. 384 cannot refer to him. βασιλέως 'A . . must therefore refer to king Antigonos and accordingly is not to be dated in 229/8, but must be placed in the period of Macedonian control (262-232). The reference to the Aetolians³ helps us to decide the date of the inscription which manifestly deals with the relations of Athens, Aetolia and Macedon after the battle of Chaeronea (245/4; cf. Kolbe, *Fest-*

¹ PW, s. v. Attalos.

² All the sources and the various interpretations of these sources are given by Wilcken and Cardinali. For more recent literature see Staehelin, *Geschichte der Kleinasiatischen Galater*, Leipzig, 1907, and Reinach, *Revue Celtique*, 30, pp. 47-72 (a review of Staehelin's work only, and does not add any new evidence).

³ This allusion to the Aetolians is another reason for not ascribing the decree to 229/8. It is unlikely that Attalos was concerned in Greek politics when he was engaged in a life and death struggle with Antiochos.

schrift für Hirschfeld, 315 ff.). From the tribe of the secretary we can date the decree exactly in the year 242/1.

IG. II. 5. 385b. certainly belongs to the same year as II. 384 as the restoration of the name of secretary from the former exactly fills the lacuna in the latter. Line 14 ff., τ[ὴν δημοκρατίαν ἐπ]ανορθώσαντες, has always been interpreted as pointing to the restoration of the democracy in 229 (Kirchner, GGA. 1900, 453). This restoration however is extremely doubtful as Köhler points out, and if correct it may only refer to the slight measure of liberty restored to the people in 256 (Ferguson, *Hell. Ath.*, p. 191). The servility which led the Athenians to offer sacrifices to Antigonos would not prevent them from characterizing the measure of liberty allowed in 256 as a "restoration of the democracy". Accordingly neither the historical nor the prosopographical evidence prevents the dating of this decree and the archon Heliodoros I. in 242/1.

It is clear that IG. II. 5. 385c cannot be dated as early as 242/1. The financial officer who paid for decrees from 262 to 232 was ὁ ἐπὶ τῇ διοικήσει. This alone excludes II. 5. 385c from being dated in this period, for in the latter the combined board ὁ ταμίης τῶν στρατιωτικῶν καὶ οἱ ἐπὶ τῇ διοικήσει pay the costs. The historical content is even more decisive against such an early date (Homolle, BCH. XV. 358). We are therefore compelled to accept Kolbe's theory of two archons named Heliodoros. The name of this archon is too short to be restored in the first line of IG. II. 859. There is no longer any necessity, therefore, for straining the interpretation of this decree in the effort to place it in 229/8 (cf. Kirchner, GGA. 1900, pp. 452-3), but we can follow the original dating of it by Homolle (BCH. XV. 358) in the years 219-7 (cf. Kolbe, *op. cit.*, 53 ff.). We shall see later good reasons for accepting Kolbe's date of this archon in 217/6.

Since the inscriptions of Heliodoros I are to be dated in 242/1, and therefore do not concern our study of the creation of Ptolemais, and since the prescript of IG. II. 5. 385c in the archonship of Heliodoros II proves nothing for or against the existence of thirteen tribes in that year, we can dismiss as unfounded what has hitherto been the greatest objection to any theory that Ptolemais was created when the Macedonian party was overthrown at Athens.

There is still one other inscription which has hitherto been considered as proof that Ptolemais was not in existence in the

year 227 B. C. This is IG. II. 5. 381b,¹ whose archon has always been identified with the archon Theophilos listed in IG. II. 859. The tribe of the secretary in 227/6 was Aiantis. From IG. II. 5. 381b we learn that the deme of the secretary began with *alpha* and, as the inscription is written *στοιχῆδόν*, must contain ten letters. But Aiantis never had a deme which satisfies these two requirements, and in the time of the thirteen tribes had no deme beginning with *alpha*. The identity of these two archons can therefore no longer be maintained. The form of the letters in IG. II. 5. 381b leads us to believe that this inscription is not later than 250 B. C. The following restoration is offered:

[ἐπὶ] Θεοφίλου ἄρχοντος ἐπὶ τῆς Κεκροπίδ[ος τρίτης]
 [πρυτ]ανείας ἢ Φίλιππος Κηφισοδώρου Ἄ[.]
 [ἐγρα]μμάτευεν' Βοηδρομιώνος ἔκτει μετ' [εἰκάδας τε-
 [τάρτ]ει καὶ εἰκοστὴ τῆς πρυτανείας κτλ.

The only possibilities for the deme of the secretary are 'Αλιμοῖσιος (Leontis), 'Αμαξαντεύς (Hippothontis) or 'Αλωπεκῆθεν (Antiochis). There are no vacancies for secretaries from Leontis or Antiochis, except in years which are already occupied by other archons. Hence we may safely restore 'Αμαξαντεύς in this inscription and date Theophilos I from the cycle in the year 272/1.

¹ Professor Kirchner informs me that Roussel has published this inscription in the *Ξένια*, Athens, 1912, p. 85, reading 'Αφ in line 2. I examined this inscription in the Epigraphical Museum at Athens in the hope of finding the letters 'Αφ, for 'Αφιδναῖος was the only word which could be restored if Theophilos is assigned to a secretary from Aiantis, but I could not see that any letter followed the Alpha. If, however, Roussel is correct, this inscription must be placed ca. 270/0 and we shall have to believe with Pomtow that there is a disturbance in the tribal rotation of the secretaries in the years ca. 280-270 B. C. (BPW. 1910, p. 1096; Ferguson, *Hellenistic Athens*, p. 164, note), or else we must assume that the deme Aphidna was divided and part still remained in the tribe Aiantis. Such an assumption is not unreasonable, for we observe that when Ptolemais was created the following demes were drawn from Aiantis for the new tribe: Aphidna, Oinoe (?), Perrhidai, Thyrgonidai, Titakidai, leaving only Kykala, Marathon, Phaleron (Psaphis), Rhamnous and Trikorynthos, a total of five (possibly six) demes in the tribe (Bates, *op. cit.* pp. 26-45). Such an arrangement is manifestly unfair to Aiantis, and we should naturally expect that some of the transfers were only parts of demes. If Roussel's reading is correct, I should take the evidence of this inscription as proof that Aphidna was divided and that the secretary in IG. II. 5. 381b is from that part of the deme which remained in Aiantis. The arrangement of the prytanies would show that the year 227/6 was intercalary.

The last inscription for discussion is IG. II. 381. This is dated in the year 226/5 B. C., and gives additional support to the theory that thirteen tribes were in existence when this decree was passed. This inscription is restored as follows:

[ἐπὶ] Ἐρ[γοχάρους ἀρχοντ]ος ἐπὶ τῆς Ἰπποθωντ[ί]
 δος τρι[τῆς πρυτανείας] ἡ Ζώϊλος Διφίλο[υ]
 Ἀλωπεκ[ῆθεν ἐγραμμάτ]ευσεν Μεταγειτνιῶ-
 νος ἐνάτ[ῃ καὶ δεκάτῃ δ]ευτέρᾳ ἐμβολί-
 μῳ εἴκοσ[τῇ τῆς πρυτανείας] κτλ.

Kirchner's explanation of this decree (*Sitzungsberichte der königlichen Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, 1910, p. 983-4) can only be accepted, if we allow that this inscription is an example of double dating, although there is nothing to indicate that such is the case. Moreover, his very complicated solution of the arrangement of the prytanies seems to be entirely at variance with the usual simplicity of the Athenians in dating their decrees. There is a much simpler solution of the problem, if we assume that there were thirteen prytanies in the archonship of Ergochares. In that case we have the choice of two solutions of the problem. If Μεταγειτνιώνος ἐνάτ[ῃ καὶ δεκάτῃ δ]ευτέρᾳ ἐμβολίμῳ means the 19th of the intercalated month Metageitnion, as Kirchner explains it, then the 20th day of the third prytany could easily fall on the 19th day of the third month in an intercalary year with thirteen prytanies. There is a similar situation in 209/8 (Kern, *Inscriptionen von Magnesia*, No. 37), where the 7th day of the 5th prytany can only fall on the 6th day of Pyanopsion, if we suppose a month to have been intercalated earlier in the year. Then the 7th day of the 5th prytany falls on the 6th day of the 5th month. If, however, the date of IG. II. 381 is correctly interpreted by the editor of the IG., then this is the 20th day of Metageitnion and we must assume that Hekatombaion was the intercalated month. This is quite possible, for we know from IG. I. Suppl. 27b. 53, p. 59 (μῆνα δὲ ἐμβάλλεν Ἑκατονβαιοῖνα τὸν νέον ἀρχοντα) that Hekatombaion was sometimes intercalated. In that case month and prytany exactly coincide.

It is not necessary to study those decrees which belong undoubtedly to the period of the 13 tribes. In all cases where the arrangement of the prytany is preserved, we find the same system as in K. 791 (II. 334), K. 783 (II. 5. 373c), and IG. II. 381. Those peculiarities found in the decrees of the archon Archelaos do not violate the rules of the thirteen prytany system, but will

be explained under that name in the discussion of the individual archons. If Professor Kirchner's system of prytanies of different lengths for IG. II. 381 is valid, then IG. II. 334 and II. 5. 373c will have to be provided for in some way which differs from this again. This, however, is most unlikely and we must conclude that the system of double dating cannot apply to decrees which do not have the phrase *κατ' ἄρχοντα, κατὰ θεόν* or *ἡμερολογδόν*.

We can no longer reasonably doubt the existence of thirteen tribes when these three decrees were passed. We must therefore push back the date of the creation of Ptolemais before the year 224/3 B. C., or else revise the dating of these decrees. The latter course is impossible in the case of K. 783 (IG. II. 5. 373c) and II. 381 if we are to place any value in the cycle of the secretaries or the list of archons in IG. II. 859. Since we confirm Koehler's reading of K. 791 (IG. II. 334), the date of this inscription must be considered anew.

Before the date of Diomedon is discussed, the data for determining Jason's archonship must be considered. This is established from the accounts of the life of Zeno and Kleantes (Philodemos, Vol. Hercul. VIII, col. 4; Index Stoicorum, coll. 28 and 29), which run as follows :¹ 1. ἀπὸ Κλεάρχου γὰρ ἐπ' Ἀρρηνεΐδην, ἐφ' οὗ σημειωθῆναι τετελευτηκέναι Ζήνωνα, ἔτη ἑστὶν ἐννέα καὶ τριάκοντα καὶ μῆνες τρεῖς. 2. γεγονέναι Κλεάνθην ἐπ' ἄρχοντος Ἀριστοφάνους καὶ τὴν σχολὴν διακατασχέιν ἐπ' ἔτη τριάκοντα καὶ ἑν. 3. ἀπηλλάγη δ' ἐπ' ἄρχοντος Ἰάσονος ἑτῶν τὰ μάλιστα ῥ (for other allusions, see Ferguson, Athenian Archons, Cornell Studies X, p. 30).

The date of Klearchos is fixed in the year 301/0. Ferguson (Priests of Asklepios, 153-4) dates Arrheneides by the exclusive system of reckoning in 261/0, but places Jason by the inclusive system in 231/0. Kolbe dates Arrheneides by the inclusive method in 262/1, Jason by the exclusive reckoning in 231/0 (op. cit. 40-45, 66). It is clear that Philodemos is not using the double system of reckoning in the same passage, and neither of these scholars can be right in both cases. By the accepted dating of Diomedon in 232/1, however, they have been forced to date Jason in 231/0.

The inclusive system of reckoning is undoubtedly the correct one (cf. Kirchner, Rh. Mus. 53, p. 383, n. 1). By this system thirty-nine years and three months from Klearchos to Arrheneides bring us to the beginning of the fourth month in the year 262/1.

¹ I have not indicated the restorations. For these see Mayer, Philologus, 1912, pp. 226 ff.

That Antipatros and Arrheneides were archons in the same year, according to the theory of Kolbe, can no longer be doubted (Kolbe, *op. cit.*, pp. 40 ff.; Kirchner, BPW. 1909, 847; cf. Ferguson, *Hellenistic Athens*, 182 note. Ferguson's objections to Kolbe's arguments are not valid so long as he himself dates Jason by inclusive reckoning in 231/0). If we calculate the date of Jason by the inclusive system of reckoning, then one hundred years from the archonship of Aristophanes (331/0) bring us to 232/1 and thirty-one years from the archonship of Arrheneides (262/1) bring us to the same year.¹ Similarly by inclusive reckoning Kallistratos is dated in the year 206/5 (Lakydes became head of the school in the fourth year of the 134th Olympiad and died 36 years later).

We may now turn to the problem of dating Diomedon. From the possibilities suggested above, when we discussed the restoration of K. 791 (IG. II. 334), the secretary must belong to one of the following tribes: Aiantis, Aigeis, Akamantis, Antigonis, Antiochis, Hippothontis, Leontis, Pandionis, or Ptolemais. The decree must be dated in the time of the twelve or of the thirteen tribes (306–201 B. C.) It cannot be later than 202/1, for the tribes Antigonis and Demetrias were abolished after that date.² The prosopographical evidence enables us to limit the document to the last half of the third century. We can infer from the fact that the powerful democratic leader Eurykleides of Kephisia was military steward, that the Macedonians exercised no control over the city or the elections. The inscription must therefore be later than 233/2 at least. The officer *ὁ ἐπὶ τῇ διοίκησει*³ who pays for the cost of the inscription did not exist between 218/7 and 202/1 (cf. IG. II. 5. 385c; Kern, *Inschriften von Magnesia*, Nr. 37). Therefore Diomedon may be limited to the years 233/2–218/7. The year 229/8 is excluded because it requires a secretary from Kekropis. It is practically certain that the archon Kalaischros is to be placed in the year 220/19. We are therefore compelled to place Diomedon in 231/0. With this date the historical content of the decree agrees.⁴ Since the year is settled

¹ Mayer (*Philologus* LXXI, p. 237, note 60) in avoiding one horn of the dilemma by reading *τριάκοντα καὶ [τὸ]ν Διονύσιον τοῖνυν* . . . in the Philodemos fragment quoted above, is forced upon the other in interpreting *μάλιστα ῥ*. Moreover, I doubt very much if he can find support for the collocation of particles *καὶ* . . . *τοῖνυν* which he has proposed.

² PW. Vol. 1, 32. 38 ff.; Tod, BSA. 1902–3, 173 ff.

³ The history of this officer will be taken up in a later paper.

⁴ Ferguson, *Hellenistic Athens*, p. 205.

we can now determine the tribe which held the secretaryship. In 231/0 the secretaryship was held by Akamantis, the 8th in the official order during the period of the thirteen tribes. The only deme in this tribe beginning with *alpha* is *Αγνούσιος*. We must therefore make this restoration in line 2 and assume that there were only 47 letters in the completed line.

We must, however, consider the other possibility, since Ferguson, Kirchner and Kolbe are all agreed on assigning Diomedon to a secretary from Leontis. This, however, is impossible, and apart from the restoration of the deme of the secretary in line 2, our clearest proof is found in K 780 (IG. II. 307). The formula for sacrifices in honor of king Antigonos contains only ca. 40 letters (K. 775 or IG. II. Add. 373b). The formula for king Demétrios is more elaborate and consists of 62 letters as we see from II. 5. 614b (cf. K. 790, 776 or IG. II. 374); *καὶ τοῦ βασιλέως Δημητρίου καὶ τῆς βασιλίσσης Φθίας*¹ *καὶ τῶν ἐγγόνων αὐτῶν*. It happens that this formula is just exactly the length desired to fill in the erased portion of K. 780 (IG. II. 307). Hence these inscriptions must be dated, not in the reign of Antigonos, but in that of Demetrios, or between 240 and 232. Since the secretary in the archonship of Thersilochos is from Leontis, we are compelled to assign this archon to the only Leontis which occurs in this period. Diomedon must therefore be given to Akamantis and Thersilochos must be dated in 233/2.

There is still another line of evidence which goes to support the theory that Ptolemais was in existence in 232/1. This is as follows: It is generally agreed that the secretary cycle was broken when Athens came again under the power of Macedon at the end of the Chremonidean war. With the Macedonian party in power, a new government was established with new officers. Kolbe's arguments dating the archons Antipatros and Arrhenides both in the year 262/1 are conclusive (op. cit., 40 ff.; Kirchner, BPW. 1909, 847). We know already that the priests of Asklepios were changed in 262/1, although both were chosen from the same tribe (Ferguson, *Priests of Asklepios*, p. 133). It is also clear that the archons were changed. The duties of the financial board *οἱ ἐπὶ τῇ διοικήσει* were handed over to the single officer *ὁ ἐπὶ τῇ διοικήσει*. When the Macedonian party came into

¹ For this reading cf. Kolbe, *Festschrift für Hirschfeld*, p. 312 ff. The shorter formula for Antigonos may be explained if Queen Phila was no longer alive in 248 B. C. K. 775 should be restored [*καὶ τοῦ βασιλέως Ἀντιγόνου καὶ τῶν ἐγγόνων αὐτοῦ*].

power in the middle of the year 262/1, the cycle of the secretaries was broken, and the secretaryship for the balance of the year was given to Antigonis in honor of the Macedonian king. If we work downward therefore from 262/1,¹ we must place the tribe Leontis in the secretaryship in 233/2. Moreover if we work back from 221/0, when the cycle of the secretaries is fixed from the decree of Thrasyphon's year (IG. II. 403) and the double dating of a Magnesian inscription (Kern. *Insch. von Magnesia*, n. 16), we find that Akamantis held the secretaryship in 231/0. The gap between Leontis in 233/2 and Akamantis in 231/0 can only be bridged in one way—that is, by inserting the tribe Ptolemais in the cycle at this point, and that this is the true solution is proved by the fact that the official position of Ptolemais is between Leontis and Akamantis.

There can be no further doubt that Ptolemais was created about the end of the archonship of Thersilochos in 233/2, before the elections of the following year, and when the officers were chosen for 232/1, the new tribe Ptolemais was given the secretaryship. The tribal rotation was not broken as in 304/3 or 262/1, but the new tribe was given seventh place, since that year called for a secretary from the seventh tribe. This explains why Ptolemais is seventh in the official order. Under the old theory Ptolemais was created ca. 224 B. C. and not given a secretaryship until 219/8. This as well as the position in the cycle was inexplicable, especially when we consider the great friendship which the Athenians had for Ptolemy, and their method of honoring the recipients when the other tribes were created.

The history of Athens at the close of Macedonian rule may now be reconstructed with more exactness. Throughout the earlier part of Demetrios' reign, there was a strong Macedonian party in control of the government as is evidenced by the number of decrees recording sacrifices in his honor. This party was supported by the king's troops which garrisoned the forts of the harbors. Towards the end of Demetrios' reign the troubles along the northern border of his kingdom forced the withdrawal of all the troops possible from the Greek garrisons (Niese, *Gesch. d. Gr. u. Mak. Staaten*, II. 275 ff.). Relying on the strength of the party favorable to him in Athens, he withdrew the major part of his forces from Attica, probably at some time during the

¹ This date for the fall of Athens is attested by Lehmann-Haupt, *BPW.* 1906, 1265; cf. Kirchner, *BPW.* 1909. 849-850; Tarn, *Antigonos Gonatas*, pp. 306 ff., note 93.

archonship of Thersilochos. This gave Eurykleides and Mikion the chance they wanted. Sometime in the course of the year 233/2, they gathered the anti-Macedonian party together and obtained control of the city, although Diogenes still held the harbor forts with Macedonian troops (cf. Plutarch, Aratus 34). The exact date of this revolution cannot be determined, but if K. 780 (IG. II. 307) recorded sacrifices in honor of Demetrios in both decrees cut on this stone, then the democratic party was not in power until after Elaphebolion. But before the elections for the following year were held the tribe Ptolemais was created and, in those elections, was given the secretaryship. This was done either because of financial assistance from Egypt already received or else in the hope of receiving material support from Ptolemy. At any rate, friendship with Egypt was the leading feature of the foreign policy of Eurykleides and Mikion, and the creation of the new tribe was a strong bid for the support of the Egyptian king. Polybios charges them with attempting to win the favor of the Ptolemies by gross flattery, and, although he was prejudiced against Athens, there may be some truth in his claim (Polybios, V. 106, 6 ff.).

The independence of Athens and the alliance with Egypt were by no means pleasing to Aratos and were only signals for the renewal of his raids on Attic territory. Since the harbors were occupied by the Macedonians under Diogenes, the alliance with Ptolemy meant little more than financial support, and because of their newly declared independence, no help could be claimed from their former defenders. The situation in the city was more or less desperate, because food-supplies could not be brought in by sea, and their own crops could not be harvested with the enemy constantly raiding their fields. In 231/0 a call for contributions was issued for military defense until the grain could be brought in (K. 791 or II. 334). About twenty thousand drachmas must have been collected. It may be observed that none of the names preserved in the list of contributors were from the harbor demes excepting only Hierokles of Sunion. The famine must have continued into the following year, for the *sitonai* were praised for the services which they rendered to the state (K. 792 or II. 335). But Attica could never yield enough grain to support her citizens even under the most favorable conditions, and relief came only on the death of Demetrios, when Diogenes agreed to hand over the harbor forts to the restored democracy (Plut.

Arat. 34; Paus. II. 8. 6; Ferguson, Hellenistic Athens, p. 206). This must have occurred some time before Thargelion in 230/29, as K. 783 (IG. II. 5. 373c) was passed in an assembly held in the Peiraieus in that month. The thanksgiving sacrifices ordered in that decree undoubtedly celebrate the return of the harbors to the city's possession.

The establishment of Ptolemais was only one of the new government's policies. The old title *γραμματεὺς τοῦ δήμου* was revived to designate the chief secretary. New legislation was passed in regard to the rights of aliens to own land. The steward of the military funds became the chief financial officer, displacing the Minister of the Administration *ὁ ἐπὶ τῇ διοικήσει*. A catalogue of the dedications to Asklepios was made and apparently some change was made in the method of appointing the priests of the god, if it is true that hereafter the regular tribal cycle was abandoned, and the election made from the people at large without regard to tribal affiliations (Ferguson, Hellenistic Athens, 205 note 3).

The establishment of the Ptolemaia at Athens followed the creation of the tribe. Since these games were celebrated in the first year of an Olympiad (Ferguson, Klio, VIII. 338 ff.) they may have been instituted first in 232/1. It is likely, however, that the authorities were more concerned with problems of defence and food-supplies than with the institution of new games. From IG. II. 379 we learn that, after Eurykleides held the post of treasurer of the military funds, he had his son appointed, and then he himself, as *agonothetes*, spent the enormous sum of seven talents in performing the games. Since he was military treasurer in 231/0 (K. 791 or IG. II. 334) he must have been *agonothetes* not earlier than 229/8. It is quite possible that he did not hold the office until 228/7, and the seven talents were expended in celebrating the first Ptolemaia at Athens. At this time all Attica was free and more able to take up the burden of such an expensive luxury.¹

It is certain that IG. II. 859 begins its record with the state officers appointed under the new democratic régime in 232/1. In this inscription there can no longer be any doubt that the *thesmothetai* are all recorded in the official order of the thirteen

¹ Probably the first definite reference to the Ptolemaia is found in a decree from Eleusis ('Αρχ. 'Εφ. 1897, p. 42), where Theophrastos as *agonothetes* in the archonship of Antiphilos seems to have cared for these games in a praiseworthy manner. But the reading is uncertain.

tribes (errors excepted). Unfortunately there is not enough evidence to determine whether Phlya was divided between Kekropis and Ptolemais. The entry under 228/7 may be another instance of the stonemason's carelessness.

The most important result following the insertion of the tribe Ptolemais in the official cycle in the year 232/1 is that the dates of those archons which fall between 261/0 and 232/1 must be shifted at least one year. In some cases greater changes are necessitated. For the sake of completeness a few notes are added on the group of archons from 276-262 and from 232-190 B. C.¹

Since Theophilos I. of IG. II. 5, 381b can no longer be identified with the archon of the same name in IG. II. 859, we have dated the former by the secretary-cycle in 272/1. Sosistratos (IG. II. 1295) can now be dated with reasonable certainty in the year 273/2, which is the only possible vacancy in the third century before 269/8, if Telokles and . . . *λαιος*² are correctly placed in 284/3 and 277/6. The prosopographical evidence demands as early a date as possible for Sosistratos, and there is no doubt that he must be placed before 269/8 (Ferguson, *Athenian Archons*, p. 37; Kirchner, *PA. s. Sosistratos*; Kolbe, *op. cit.*, p. 45).

The year 270/69 is occupied by the archon whose name stood in K. 702, 703. This name had 7 or 8 letters.

Philoneos (K 765, 766, IG. II. 337, 338) must be placed before the end of the Chremonidean war (Ferguson, *Priests of Asklepios*, p. 155. Kolbe disagrees but his arguments are not convincing, *op. cit.*, p. 61). Hermodoros, the *παιδοτρίβης*, acted in the same capacity in the archonship of Menekles (K 665 or II. 316, 283/2 B. C.). It is very unlikely that any ephebic decrees were passed between 262 and 256 (Ferguson, *Priests of Asklepios*, p. 156) and we can not reasonably expect that Hermodoros acted as *παιδοτρίβης* from 283 until after 256. Between 270-262 the officer

¹ The evidence for the archons in the period here discussed is given in full in Ferguson, *Athenian Archons*, Cornell Studies, 1899, Vol. X; *The Priests of Asklepios*, Univ. of California Publications, 1907, pp. 131-173; Kirchner, *GGA*, 1900, pp. 400 ff.; BPW., 1906, pp. 980 ff., *ibid.*, 1909, pp. 844 ff.; Kolbe, *Die Attischen Archonten*, *Abhandlungen der königl. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen*, Band X, n. 4.

² These three archons may possibly be interchanged. The archons from the years ca. 280-270 may have to be changed if Pomtow succeeds in proving a disturbance in the cycle (BPW. 1910, p. 1096; Ferguson, *Hellenistic Athens*, 164 note).

ὁ ἐπὶ τῇ διοικήσει paid the cost of decrees until the beginning of the Chremonidean war in 266/5, when the college οἱ ἐπὶ τῇ διοικήσει was established. If in K. 766 (IG. II. 338) we make the restorations in lines 13 and 14, preserving the στοιχηδόν arrangement in the missing portions as is the case in the other lines, we must read [τὸν] ἐπὶ τῇ διοικήσει (the στοιχηδόν arrangement is violated only at the beginning of these lines and not at the end—as we see by the restoration). K. 766 (IG. II. 338) was passed in the year following the archonship of Philoneos and must be prior to 266/5 because of the single officer ὁ ἐπὶ τῇ διοικήσει. Philoneos must therefore be placed in the year 269/8, which is the only vacancy available, for if he were dated in 267/6, we should have to place K. 766 (IG. II. 338) in the year 266/5 when the board οἱ ἐπὶ τῇ διοικήσει was in existence (K. 686). Since ἐπὶ Φιλόνεω may be restored in K. 702, 703 it is quite possible that Philoneos may be dated in the year 270/69. If we make this restoration in K. 702, 703, then the archon Φίλο[. . .] in K. 767 must not be identified with Philoneos as K. 767 cannot be restored from K. 703, if the reading in line 3 of K. 767 is correct.

Thymochares (K. 700 or IG. II. 371) may be identified with Θυμοχάρης Σφήττιος who was *agonothetes* in 276/5 (K. 682 or II. 331) and contributor to the military fund in 231/0 (K. 691 or II. 334). K. 700 (IG. II. 371)¹ was certainly passed in the time of the twelve tribes as the list of *proedroi* proves. If the identification proposed is correct, Thymochares belonged to the democratic party with anti-Macedonian tendencies. It is unlikely that he held the archonship during the Macedonian régime, and in that case he must be dated before the fall of Athens in 262/1. Since Hermodoros is παιδοτρίβης in the archonship of Thymochares as well in the year 282/1 (K. 665), we are justified in seeking as early a date as possible for this archon. It may be noted that the archon preceding him has ten letters in his name (K. 700 line 10). We must therefore date Thymochares in 267/6 after the archonship of Philokrates since this date alone fulfils all the conditions.

Glaukippos (K. 674, 675, 676) may be dated by the cycle in the years 277/6, 265/4, 258/7 or 246/5. The last two are excluded

¹It should be noted that this is an ephebic decree and that no ephebic decrees are found from 262–240 during the reign of Antigonos. The system seems to have been in abeyance during that period. I so there is no other possible date for Thymochares.

because the officer $\delta \epsilon \pi \iota \tau \eta \delta \iota \omicron \iota \kappa \acute{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \iota$ is in control from 262/1–232/1, while in the archonship of Glaukippos the board $\omicron \iota \epsilon \pi \iota \tau \eta \delta \iota \omicron \iota \kappa \acute{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \iota$ paid for the decree (K. 674, 676). Of the other two dates, the former is now excluded by our dating Sosistratos in 272/1 which prevents the shifting of Telokles or . . . $\lambda \alpha \iota \omicron \varsigma$ from 277/6. Moreover the prosopographical evidence favors the latest date possible (Ferguson, *Ath. Arch.*, p. 34; Kolbe, *op. cit.*, p. 58). The close relationship between K. 674, 676 (IG. II. 305) and K. 689 (II. 325) shows that they are contemporary or very nearly so. Since the latter must be placed in the time of the Chremonidean war, Glaukippos must be dated in 265/4.

K. 689 (IG. II. 325) allows several restorations, for the name of the archon, which ends in -ides,¹ has ten letters and the following archons of the 3d century have the requisite number: $\text{'}\text{Α}\text{ρισ}\text{τε}\text{ίδ}\text{ης}$, $\text{'}\text{Α}\text{ρ}\text{ρ}\text{ε}\text{ν}\text{ε}\text{ίδ}\text{ης}$, $\text{Φ}\text{ι}\text{λ}\text{ι}\text{π}\text{π}\text{ί}\text{δ}\text{ης}$ and $\text{Λ}\text{υ}\text{σ}\text{ι}\text{θ}\text{ε}\text{ίδ}\text{ης}$. Of these the first is rejected, because in his archonship a dedication was made in honor of the priest of Herakles (IG. II. 1166). This priest appears to be identical with the priest of Zeus Soter (IG. II. 616) and as in K. 689 (IG. II. 325) the cult of Zeus Soter was most important, there could hardly be a dedication of the priest in his minor aspect without making any reference to his other more important duties. $\text{'}\text{Α}\text{ρ}\text{ρ}\text{ε}\text{ν}\text{ε}\text{ίδ}\text{ης}$ is also impossible, for in his archonship the officer $\delta \epsilon \pi \iota \tau \eta \delta \iota \omicron \iota \kappa \acute{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \iota$ existed, while in K. 689 (II. 325) the expenses are defrayed by $\omicron \iota \epsilon \pi \iota \tau \eta \delta \iota \omicron \iota \kappa \acute{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \iota$. The decree in the archonship of Arrheneides (Diog. Laert., VII. 9) was passed on the 22d of Maimakterion and it is certain that the officer $\delta \epsilon \pi \iota \tau \eta \delta \iota \omicron \iota \kappa \acute{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \iota$ was created before this date and continued to exist until the archonship of Diomedon (K. 791 or IG. II. 334). If we restore K. 689 (IG. II. 325), the following combinations of month and prytany are possible: Anthesterion 20th, Elaphebolion 10th or 11th, Mounychion 11th or 12th. It is impossible therefore that the officer $\delta \epsilon \pi \iota \tau \eta \delta \iota \omicron \iota \kappa \acute{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \iota$ should have been created at the beginning of Arrheneides' archonship, changed to $\omicron \iota \epsilon \pi \iota \tau \eta \delta \iota \omicron \iota \kappa \acute{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \iota$ in one of the later months and then changed again to the single officer $\delta \epsilon \pi \iota \tau \eta \delta \iota \omicron \iota \kappa \acute{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \iota$ who is found from 256–231. There is absolutely no warrant for such a history of the board from our knowledge of the politics of Athens at this time.

¹ The reading Iota on the stone is certain. The inscription is $\sigma \omicron \iota \chi \chi \eta \theta \acute{\omicron} \nu$ and the hasta of the Iota is directly over the centre of the Epsilon in the line below. There is moreover no trace of any cross-bar, so that all possibility of a reading $\text{-H}\Delta\text{O-}$ is excluded.

Of the other two possibilities Philippides is the better, since Lysitheidēs is probably to be dated in the latter part of the century (IG. II. 620, II. 5. 620b). The *orgeones* of Bendis, who set up the inscription in the archonship of Lysitheidēs (II. 620), were most active after the Chremonidean war (Wilhelm, Oesterr. Jahreshefte, 1902, pp. 127 ff.; Ferguson, Hellenistic Athens, p. 220). Philippides is known only from a dedicatory inscription set up by the *Hieropoioi* of Artemis in his archonship (IG. II. 1333). From the character of the writing he is assigned to the third century. This name may very well be restored in IG. II. 325, but names in -ides are so common that it is possible that some other name is to be assigned to this decree. This inscription is limited by the board *οἱ ἐπὶ τῇ διοικήσει* to the years 294/3—276/5 or 266/5—262/1. The only vacancy in these years is 263/2.

The archons Antipatros and Arrheneides are both to be assigned to the year 262/1 as Kolbe has already shown (op. cit., 40 ff.; Kirchner, BPW. 1909, 847). It is to be noted that in replacing the officers under the new régime, the cycle of the secretaries alone was broken. The priest of Asklepios was re-elected from the same tribe. Thus the priest's cycle remained one year behind that of the secretaries. This method avoided giving one tribe two of the most important offices in any one year. This system of tribal rotation in choosing the priest was kept up until at least 253/2 (Ferguson, Priests of Asklepios, 133), but seems to have been abandoned by 215/4 (loc. cit., p. 134). There is no evidence to determine when this method of election was abandoned. In the archonship of Diomedon (IG. II. 836) there was apparently an auditing of the treasures and the inventory was recorded on stone. This would be the logical year for assigning any reform to the system, but it is not clear why a regular system of election should be abandoned for an irregular one.

If we should assume that the deme Phlya was not transferred in its entirety to Ptolemais at its establishment, it is equally possible that Oinoe was not transferred from Hippothontis. There are only two inscriptions which prove that a deme Oinoe belonged to Ptolemais (II. 956. 469), and there is no reason why this should not be a part of the Oinoe which once belonged to Aiantis. In that case the regular system of tribal rotation may have been followed as late as 201/0 in appointing the priest of Asklepios.

The establishment of Ptolemais in 232/1 and its insertion in the cycle at this point, affects the dating of all the archons between 262/1 and 232/1. These will now be discussed in detail.

Although it is probable that very few decrees were passed during the five years which followed the end of the Chremonidean war (Ferguson, *Hellenistic Athens*, 183, 191), yet it is evident that the popular assemblies were not entirely suspended. Besides the decree conferring funeral honors on Zeno, which seems to have been passed at the request of the king (Diog. Laert. VII. 6), there are a few other decrees belonging to this period whose general subject matter is unknown, or else deal only with matters of routine. Kirchner (K. 765-769) apparently assigns the archons Philoneos, Philostratos, Antimachos and Phanostratos to this period. The date of Philoneos has already been discussed. It seems to me that the prosopographical evidence is entirely against any date after the close of the Chremonidean war for this archon. There are no ephebic decrees which can be dated with certainty during the reign of Antigonos, and it seems unlikely that this democratic institution should have been allowed during the years 262-256. This archon therefore may safely be excluded from consideration. There is less doubt about the other names. Kirchner has clearly proved that Antimachos cannot belong to the time of the thirteen tribes (cf. K. 768, 769 and notes), and from the tribe of the secretary this archon must be placed in the year 258/7. As a corollary to this, Philostratos and Phanostratos (Πρακτικά, 1891, p. 16) must be dated in the years 260/59 and 259/8 respectively.

In one of the new inscriptions published by Kirchner there is very strong support for the change in the tribal rotation of the secretaries necessitated by the insertion of Ptolemais in the cycle in 232/1 B. C. This is K. 704. There is no doubt that this inscription belongs to the time of the twelve tribes as the arrangement of the prytanies shows. The formula *τὴν πρώτην ἐκκλησίαν* does not occur in the latter half of the third century (cf. Kirchner *ad* K. 768). The secretary recorded in this decree is from the tribe Leontis, and according to the previous cycles there was no vacancy for this tribe in the third century, since those years to which a secretary from Leontis was assigned were already occupied by archons whose names could not be restored

in K. 704. In the cycle as we have reconstructed it, this inscription must be dated in the year 256/5.¹

Diogeiton (K. 771, 772 or II. 352b, Add. Nov.) must be placed in the year 253/2 from the cycle, since the other possibility (241/0) is now filled by Athenodoros.

Olbios (K. 773 or II. 5. 345b, IG. II. 602) is dated from the cycle in 252/1.

In K. 774 (II. 5. 371c) the deme of the secretary must be restored as *Ei[τρεαῖος]*. The other possibility *Ei[ρσειδης]* is inadmissible since there is no vacancy for the tribe Antigonis in the third century within the limits imposed by the context of the decree. (Kirchner, BPW. 1906, 990 ff.). This deme belongs to Antiochis and the decree is dated in the year 251/0 from the cycle (Ferguson, Priests of Asklepios, 133).

Pheidostratos (IG. II. 1199) is to be restored with considerable probability in K. 734 (II. 280)² which is restored as follows:

[ἐπὶ Φειδοστράτου ἀρχοντος ἐπὶ τῆς Κε]κροπίδος
[τρίτης πρυτανείας ἢ Κηφι]σοδώρου 'Ικ-
[αριεύς ἐγραμμάτευεν· Βοηδρομιώνος] ἐβδόμῃ ἐπ-
[ὶ δέκα, ἔκτει καὶ δεκάτῃ τῆς πρυτανε]ίας· ἐκκλησ-
[ία κυρία· κτλ.]

¹ The date of the archon Theophemos (K. 795 or II. 373) is problematical. The following restoration is suggested for K. 795:

ἐπὶ Θεοφύμου ἀρχοντος ἐπὶ [τῆς τετάρτης]
πρυτανείας ἢ Προκλής 'Απ [. ἐγραμ-]
[μά]τευεν· Πνανοψιδίως ἐκ[τεῖ ἐπὶ δέκα· τετάρτῃ καὶ]
[δεκ]άτῃ τῆς πρυτανε[ίας]

Pyanopsion is the fourth month, so we may restore *τετάρτης* for the prytany. By restoring Aigeis or Oineis as the name of the prytanizing tribe, the shortest length of line is 41 letters. The same length may be secured in line 3 by restoring the 16th of the month and the 14th of the prytany (Schmidt, Handbuch der Griechischen Chronologie, 771; table c). This is found on trial to be the only possible length, or combination. The restoration of line 2 is offered only as a suggestion. From Kirchner's Pros. Att. under 'Απ. we find the following which fill out line 2: 'Απολλόδωρος Φλυεύς, 'Απολλωνίδης Πιθεύς or 'Υβάδης, 'Απολλώνιος Ἑρμείος or Κριωεύς or Οἰναιός. Of these only the first two need be considered as, in the other cases, the demes are from tribes for which there is no vacancy in the secretary cycle. The first two belong to the same tribe—Kekropis—for which the only vacancy in the tribal cycle is 254/3. But this restoration and dating is offered only as a suggestion, and by no means as a probability.

² The editor of this inscription in the IG. is incorrect when he states that it is broken on both sides. The right edge is intact. We can therefore determine absolutely the number of letters in the archon's name when once we determine the length of the line.

The deme of the secretary in line 2 is certainly Ἰκαριεύς, for clear traces of the Kappa at the end of the line are still to be seen on the stone. The name of the month in line 3 can only be determined in conjunction with the restoration of line 4. The day of the month is certainly ἐβδόμῃ ἐπὶ δέκα or the 17th. If we assume provisionally that this is an ordinary year, the day of the prytany must lie between the 14th and the 29th (Schmidt, *Handbuch der Griechischen Chronologie*, 771 ff.). The restoration of εἰκοστῇ is impossible because it gives too short a line, for if we restore line 3 with the name of the month containing fewest letters, we have a minimum length of 37 letters. Of the other prytany days the 16th gives the shortest length for line 4, that is, 39 letters. Line 4 can be restored with the same length by reading ἔκτει καὶ δεκάτει. The name of the archon in line 1 must therefore have at least twelve letters. This is unusually long, but if we attempt any other restorations we find that line 3 may have 37, 38, 39, 40, and 41 letters. But no possible combination in line 4 between prytany day and the day of the month admits a line of less than 39 letters. This holds good for intercalary years as well. Those restorations giving a line of 40 or 41 letters may be discarded because they require an archon's name of 13 or 14 letters. Such names are unknown. Those of 12 letters are extremely rare, but there is one name only of the archons assigned to the third century which is of the required length. This is Pheidistratos who is dated approximately ca. 250 (Kirchner, *Rh. Mus.* 53, 388). Since Ikaria belongs to the tribe Antigonis, and the only vacancy for this tribe in the cycle is 250/49, there is little doubt of the correctness of this restoration.

The archon Lysiades (K. 775 or II. 373b, Add. Nov.) is dated from the cycle for the priests of Asklepios (Ferguson, *Priests of Asklepios*, 140). There is an erasure in this decree which cut out the allusion to the sacrifices in honor of one of the kings of Macedon. We know that the formula decreeing sacrifices in honor of Demetrios consists of 60 letters (IG. II. 5. 614b, K. 780 (II. 307), K. 776 (374), K. 790 (Klio, VIII. 487)). The erasure in IG. II. 373b (Nov. Add.) contained at most 38 letters and can only refer to Antigonos. It must therefore be dated before 239 B. C. (Ferguson, *Hellenistic Athens*, p. 198, and note 4). Since the priest of Asklepios is from Xypete the date of the first decree can be determined from the cycle in 248/9.

The decree passed in the archonship of Lysiades which is cut on the same stone was proposed by the same author. It is not likely that two decrees were passed in the same year in honor of the same man. But the second must not be many years later. The only possible dates are 247/6, 244/3 or 243/2. The first of these is preferable since the last two should probably be occupied by Lykeas and Polystratos.

The archon Hagnias is recorded in K. 794 (II. 372). This inscription is written *στοιχηδόν* and is therefore not later than the third century. The following restoration is proposed:

ἐπὶ Ἀγνίου ἀρχο[ντος ἐπὶ τῆς τρίτης πρυτα-]
νείας ἢ Ποτάμων Δόν[ακος Μυρρινούσιος ἐγραμμάτευν]
Βοηδρομιῶνος τετράδ[ι μετ' εἰκάδας ἔκτει καὶ εἰκοστῇ]
τῆς πρυτανείας βουλῇ ἐν[.]

The shortest possible restoration in line 3 is [ἔκτει καὶ εἰκοστῇ] as the day of the prytany. This gives a minimum length of 45 letters. By restoring *τρίτει, πέμπτει* or *τετάρτει*, we have a line of 46, 47 or 48 letters. But from line 1 we learn that the maximum length is 46. We may therefore have lines of 45 or 46 letters. The deme of the secretary must have therefore twelve or thirteen letters. There are only four possibilities; *Μυρρινούσιος* (Pandionis), *Ἀμαξαντεῖς* (Hippothontis), *Ἀμφιτροπήθεν* (Antiochis) or *Κυδαθηναῖς* (Antigonis). For the last three tribes there is no vacancy in the cycle, and a secretary from Pandionis must be dated 246/5. The year 246/5 is thus the only possible date for Hagnias.

The archons Kleomachos (K. 770 or II. 336), Kallimedes (K. 777 or II. 306, K. 780 or II. 307) and Thersilochos K. 778 or II. 308, K. 780 or II. 307, K. 781 or II. 5. 307b, K. 782 or II. 5. 307c) form a group which must be studied together, since Theokritos was general in the archonship of all three (Kirchner, AM. 1907, 470 ff.). The possible dates from the cycle are 257, 247 and 245 or 245, 235 and 233. From K. 778 (II. 308) we learn that in the archonship of Thersilochos, the Athenians and Boeotians accept the city Lamia—a dependency of Macedon—as arbitrator in a dispute between the two states. This could not have happened in 245/4 for in that year the Boeotians were in alliance with the Achaean League and hostile to Athens and Macedon. After the battle of Chaeronea in 245/4, they deserted the league and became friendly to the Macedonian party (Niese, *Gesch. d. gr. u. maced. Staaten*, II. 250). K. 778 (II. 308) must consequently

date later than 245/4, and Thersilochos is therefore assigned to 233/2, Kallimedes to 235/4 and Kleomachos to 245/4. With these dates all our evidence agrees. The erased portion of K. 780 (II. 307) is exactly filled by the formula for sacrifice in honor of King Demetrios (239-229 B. C.) found in IG. II. 5. 614b, while that in honor of Antigonos is at least 22 letters shorter (cf. K. 775 or IG. II. 373b, Nov. Add. See under archon Lysiades). This is decisive proof that Thersilochos must be dated after the accession of Demetrios.

The general Theokritos is son of the *πάρεδρος*, Ἀλκίμαχος Κλεοβούλου Μυρρινούσιος, who held office in 282/1 (K. 668 or IG. II. 5. 318b), and the later date for his command as *στρατηγός* accords better with the period 245-33 than 257-43.

Polystratos (Oesterr. Jahreshefte, V. 128) requires as late a date as possible because of the form *γίνεσθαι* which occurs in the inscription from his archonship. The earliest datable example of this form is in 238/7 or slightly later (IG. II. 5. 614b), though it is possible that IG. II. 5. 591b may be dated before the death of Antigonos in 241 B. C. Polystratos cannot be placed later than 243/2 as there is no vacancy, and there can be little doubt that he is to be placed in this or in the year immediately preceding.

There is no evidence at hand for the date of Lykeas. Wilhelm (Oesterr. Jahreshefte V. 136) says that he is probably to be closely associated with Polystratos.

Heliodoros I. (IG. II. 384, II. 5. 385b) has already been discussed and dated in the year 242/1 from the allusion to King Antigonos and the Aetolians in IG. II. 384, and with the aid of the cycle.

Athenodoros (K. 784, Ἀρχ. Ἐφ., 1911. 222 ff.) is dated by Oikonomos in the year 240/39 by the prosopographical evidence combined with the cycle. In the revised scheme, this archon will be dated in the year 241/0.

In lines 10-11 of K. 798 (IG. II. 5. 373g) we can restore either ἐπὶ Ἀθηνοδώρου or ἐπὶ Ἀλκιβιάδου. The latter restoration however is excluded because of the unfriendly relations between the Athenians and Aetolians which existed from 238/7 onward through the reign of Demetrios (Ferguson, Hellenistic Athens, 200 ff.) while this decree implies close friendship. It must therefore be dated between 241/0 and 238/7. The shortest possible restoration (ἐπὶ Ἀνυσίου) in line 1 of K. 798 gives a minimum of 52 letters, although Kirchner estimates the average length at ca. 42. If we

date this decree in the archonship of Lysias, we must conclude that Athens and Aetolia were still on friendly footing in the month Gamelion in Lysias' archonship. This however is improbable (cf. IG. II. 5. 614b) and we may have to assign this decree to the archonship of Athenodoros or Charikles. The restoration *ἐπὶ Χαρίκλέους* is better because it gives a shorter line, and the arrangement of the prytanies seems to require that this document be dated in an intercalary year. The year 242/1 suits the historical content of the document (Ferguson, *Hellenistic Athens*, 196, note). Further allusion to the friendly relations between Athens and Aetolia is found in IG. II. 384 (242/1).

Charikles (K. 785, 'Αρχ. 'Εφ., 1901. 52) is dated by the secretary cycle in 240/39. Lysias and Kimon (IG. II. 5. 614b) must be dated in the two years immediately preceding the secretary from Hippotomadai (K. 787 or IG. II. 330) who held office in 237/6 (Kolbe, *op. cit.*, 62 ff.).

Ekphantos and Lysanias (K. 788, *Oesterr. Jahresh.* V. 136; K. 790, *Klio*. VIII. 487) can be placed in 237/6 and 236/5 respectively from the tribes of their secretaries (K. 787 or IG. II. 330; K. 790, *Klio*. VIII. 487). The formula for sacrifice in the archonship of Lysanias is of the same length as that in IG. II. 5. 614b which should be restored in the erased portion of the Lysanias decree. The formula for sacrifices in honor of Antigonos requires only 38 spaces (K. 775 or IG. II. 373b) and cannot be restored here. These archons must therefore be dated in the reign of Demetrios or between 240/39 and 232/1. (Kolbe dates these archons in 248/7 and 247/6 (*op. cit.*, p. 56), but the latter year is occupied by Lysiades. Our restoration of the erased lines decides the question in favor of the dates proposed by Ferguson, *Priests of Asklepios*, 133).

Alkibiades (K. 776 or IG. II. 374) is also to be dated in the reign of Demetrios because lines 8 and 9 can be restored¹ exactly from IG. II. 5. 614b as follows:

[καὶ τοῦ βασιλέως Δημητρίου καὶ τῆς βασιλίσσης]
 Φθίας καὶ τῶν ἐγγόνων αὐτῶν] ἐπειδὴ ἡ ἑρέει-
 [α κτλ. . .]

¹ For another restoration cf. Wilamowitz, *Antigonos von Karystos*, 229, 60. This would require the date of this inscription to be placed before 248 B. C. (cf. list of archons at the end of this paper) and the formula for sacrifice to Antigonos as we learn from K. 775 was considerably shorter than this. The shorter formula may be due to the fact that the queen Phila was not alive at this time.

This inscription must be placed between 240/39 and 232/1. Since there is only one vacant year in this period, 234/3, Alkibiades must be dated in that year. The prosopographical evidence is entirely in accord with this date (Kirchner, *Pros. Att.*, s. v. *Λυσιστράτη* and *Ἀρχέστρατος*). It is to be noted that all through the reign of Demetrios sacrifices were offered for him. This shows that there must have been a strong pro-Macedonian party at Athens controlling the assemblies. Relying on the strength and faithfulness of this party Demetrios did not hesitate to weaken his garrisons in Attica when the troubles at home began to demand all his available troops for the defense of the northern boundaries.

The dates of Jason and Diomedon have already been established in the years 232/1 and 231/0 respectively.

K. 783 (II. 5. 373c) has been placed in the year 230/29 by the cycle. The archon's name must have seven or eight letters. K. 792 (II. 335) is dated in this period because of the probable identity of *Ἐπίωτος Μελιτεύς*, the grain commissioner, with the contributor to the defence fund in 232/1 (K. 791 or II. 334). There is therefore little doubt that these two decrees are contemporary. The year 229/8 is not open to the archon . . . βιος because this name is too short to be restored in IG. II. 859, line 1. These *sitonai* were probably appointed to deal with the grain famine which the city must have suffered since Diogenes was still in command of the harbors (Ferguson, *Hellenistic Athens*, p. 206).

Since . . . (?) βιος fills the lacuna in line 1 of K. 783 (II. 5. 373c), there can be no doubt that this is the correct restoration. K. 792 (IG. II. 335) was passed in the same or the following year. This inscription is important in the history of the financial boards at Athens because it proves that after the single officer *ὁ ἐπὶ τῇ διοικήσει* disappeared (IG. II. 334) the treasurer of the military funds alone paid the cost of the decrees. Later on he was associated with the plural board appointed in charge of the administration (*ὁ ταμίης τῶν στρατιωτικῶν καὶ οἱ ἐπὶ τῇ διοικήσει*, IG. II. 5. 385c).

The restoration of IG. II. 859, line 1, is again an open question. Certainly *Ἡλιόδωρος* is no longer entitled to consideration for this place, and since his name is one letter too short, we should restore some word of ten letters. The most likely claimant is *Lysitheides* (IG. II. 620, II. 5. 620b). Köhler has dated

this archon in the latter part of the century from the character of the writing (cf. Wilhelm, Oesterr. Jahreshefte, 1902, 130, note 1). Since IG. II. 620b is written *στοιχηδόν* and IG. II. 620 is nearly so, we can date these decrees before the end of the third century. Examples of *στοιχηδόν* writing are rare after 230, although one is found as late as 205/4 B. C. (IG. II. 5. 385f.). The only vacancy for Lysitheides between 244 and 209 is in 229/8, and since his name exactly fills the lacuna in II, 859, line 1, it is probable that he should be dated in that year. In that case we can no longer identify him with *Λυσιθείδης Σφήπτιος* who is contributor to the war chest in 232/1 (K. 791 or IG. II. 334). These inscriptions if dated in 229/8 indicate a revival of the activities of the *orgeones* in the Peiraieus after the town and harbor were once more united under the democracy.

The group of archons from 228/7-221/0 is firmly established by the evidence of IG. II. 859, and the identification of the year of the archon Thrasyphon with the fourth year of the 139th Olympiad (Kern, *Inscriptionen von Magnesia*, 16). The correctness of Kirchner's restoration [*Θρασυφ*]ῶν *Ἀλωπεκῆθεν* in line 15 of IG. II. 859 is beyond dispute (GGA. 1900. 448).

The archons from 220/19-217/6 inclusive form a group by themselves. In this case there is no help from IG. II. 859. Chairephon is fixed in the year 219/8 by the fact that the Greater Eleusinia were celebrated in his archonship (IG. II. 5. 619b, Kolbe, op. cit., 69 ff.). There are three candidates for the other years: Kallaischros, Heliodoros II. and Archelaos. Of these we know that Archelaos follows Heliodoros (IG. II. 5. 385c).

Kallaischros is known only from an inscription found at Eleusis (*Ἀρχ. Ἐφ.*, 1897, p. 42 ff.). This decree states that Theophrastos was gymnasiarch in the archonship of Antiphilos (224/3), hipparch in the archonship of Menekrates (222/1) and, after service as steward (*ταμίας τῶν στρατιωτικῶν* probably), was elected general at Eleusis in the archonship of Kallaischros. The earliest possible date for this archon is therefore 220/19. Heliodoros can not be placed earlier than 219/8. Since Archelaos follows Heliodoros immediately, these two archons are grouped together after 219/8. Kallaischros must therefore be dated in the year 220/19.

Heliodoros II. can be dated only by the historical context of IG. II. 5. 385c, since the identification with Heliodoros of IG. II.

384, II. 5, 385b is no longer possible. There is no good reason for disputing Homolle's approximate dating (BCH. XV., 1891, 385 ff., Kolbe, op. cit., 52-5). Cardinali's objections (*Rivista di storia antica*, N. S. 9, 81 ff.) are based on the theory that this Heliodoros must antedate the creation of Ptolemais. But there is nothing to prove that IG. II. 5. 385c was not passed when there were thirteen tribes, since the identification with IG. II. 5. 385b is no longer valid. From IG. II. 5. 385c it is easily seen that Archelaos follows Heliodoros at a very short interval. We can date both archons in the years 218/7 and 217/6 respectively. Otherwise Archelaos must be dated in 212/1. But an interval of five years is too long. These two archons therefore remain in the years assigned.

Archelaos of IG. II. 5. 385c is not the archon of the same name in IG. II. 431. This identification has been the cause of much tribulation to the interpreters of these decrees. There are three reasons to be urged against this identity. In the latter inscription the cost of the document is paid by *ὁ ἐπὶ τῇ διοίκησει* while we know that from the archonship of Heliodoros in 218/7 (IG. II. 5. 385c) until the archonship of Philostratos (Kern, *In-schriften von Magnesia*, 37) this was defrayed by *ὁ ταμίης τῶν στρατιωτικῶν καὶ οἱ ἐπὶ τῇ διοίκησει*. Secondly the accepted date of IG. II. 431 in 212/1 is impossible because the meeting of the assembly in that decree was held in the Eleusinion, and this only took place in a year when the Eleusinia were performed (Andocides, *De Mysteriis*, c. III.) or in the second year of each Olympiad (Kolbe, op. cit., p. 70). Hence IG. II. 431 cannot be dated in 212/1 or in 217/6. (This does not invalidate our argument as to the date of Hagnias, for the restoration *ἐν[τῷ 'Ελευσινίῳ]* in that decree is purely conjectural). Lastly, the prytany scheme of these two inscriptions is an impossible problem if the two archons are considered identical. From IG. II. 5. 385c we learn that the month Anthesterion was intercalated. With thirteen prytanizing tribes we should have prytanies corresponding to the months. But in IG. II. 431 there are two decrees recorded—both passed in the month Boedromion, but in different prytanies. This state of affairs is explained by assuming that they began the year as an ordinary year with prytanies of 27 days each, but some time after Boedromion they changed their plan and inserted an extra month. This was done in 307/6 but it was justified then—and in fact practically necessary—to avoid

having the remaining prytanies of too short a length (Kirchner, *Sitzungsberichte d. kgl. Pr. Ak. d. Wissens.*, 1910, p. 982). There is no such excuse, however, for the year 212/1 if these decrees are dated in that year. Let us reconsider the restoration of the scheme of the prytanies in the two decrees found in IG. II. 431. The following reading is offered for the first:

Boηδρο-
[μ]ῶ[νος ἐνεὶ καὶ νέαι, τετάρτει καὶ εἰ]κο[στεί τῆς π]ρυτανεί-
[ας] κτλ.

and similarly in the second:¹

Bo-
[η]δρομιῶνος [ἐμβολίμον ἐνδεκάτει, τρίτ]ει τῆς πρυτανείας

Although the writing is not *στοιχῆδόν* the average length of each line in both decrees is 47 letters. The restorations proposed at least have the merit of giving a uniform line. Such a combination of month and prytany is possible only in an intercalary year with twelve prytanies (cf. Schmidt, *Handbuch der Griechischen Chronologie*, p. 775, Tafel b). According to this restoration we must date IG. II. 431 in the time of the twelve tribes and after 201/0 as is proved by the identity of Lanomos with Lanomos of Berenikidai (Wilhelm, UDA. 214). Since the officer *ὁ ἐπὶ τῇ διοικήσει* was in existence from 201 until 190 B. C. this inscription must be dated in this period and, from the cycle, the date of Archelaos II can be established precisely in the year 191/0. It may be noted that this is the second year of an Olympiad and the Assembly could therefore be held in the Eleusinion.

This date for IG. II. 431 removes the prosopographical difficulties as well as the most curious irregularities in the calendar which were involved in the original dating. There is no possibility of dating the second decree in IG. II. 5. 385c as late as 191/0 and there is no reasonable objection against dating it in 217/6.

Pantiades (Croenert, Kolotes und Menedemos, 77, col. XXVII. 4; Wilamowitz, *Hermes*, 1910. 406), Diokles, Euphiletos and Herakleitos are placed in the years 216/5-213/2.

It is probable that we should assign to the archonship of Herakleitos the two inscriptions K. 796. 797 (IG. II. 5. 252c, II. add. 252b) as the name of this archon can be restored in each. This

¹ This restoration accords very well with the traces of letters still appearing on the stone. (See facsimile published in the IG.)

is the only year between 307-202 B. C. which is open to a secretary from Antiochis, and the only year with an archon whose name can be restored in these inscriptions. The restoration of K. 797 as given by Kirchner is incorrect, as there is no example of the form ἐγραμμάτευσ known in prescripts after 290 B. C. Lines 2-6 should be restored as follows :

[ἐφ' Ἡρακλείτου ἀρχοντος ἐπὶ τῆς Δημητριά[δος πρώτης]
[πρυτανείας ἥ]ος Λύκου Ἀλωπεκῆθ[εν ἐγραμμά-]
[τευν· Ἐκατομβαιωνος ἐν]ει καὶ νέαι, τριακοσ[τεῖ τῆς πρ]
[υτανείας κτλ.

The arrangement of the prytanies shows that the year of Heraклеitos is intercalary, and in the time of the thirteen tribes in such a case month and prytany correspond closely.

As a result of dating Archelaos I in 217/6 and Archelaos II in 191/0, the year 212/1 is once more unoccupied. The most probable candidate for this is Philinos (IG. II. 5. 619c, Add.). In his archonship Σωσικράτης Μιλτιάδου Σφήγγιος was elected ταμίης τῶν στρατιωτικῶν and was praised by the citizens of Eleusis for the way in which he performed his duties. Troops were stationed at Eleusis from 225 B. C. until about the end of the century (Ferguson, *Hellenistic Athens*, 249 and note 2, 251 and note 1). The possible dates for Philinos are 212/1, 210/9, 208/7-206/5, 204/3 or 203/2. A definite choice is not possible with our present evidence, but since most of the decrees from Eleusis honoring Athenian officials belong to the period before 208, it is probable that Philinos should be assigned to one of the earlier years. Kolbe has restored Isokrates provisionally in IG. II. 385 which was passed in the year 210/9 (op. cit., p. 73). If this restoration be accepted, then Philinos must be dated in the year 212/1.

We must assign to the year 209/8 the Attic decree found at Magnesia (Kern, *Inscripfen von Magnesia*, 37). The arrangement of the prytanies shows that it is to be dated in the time of the thirteen tribes, for the 7th day of the 5th prytany can only fall on the 6th day of Pyanopsion if we suppose a month to have been intercalated earlier in the year. Then the 7th day of the 5th prytany falls on the 6th day of the 5th month. This is of course only possible when there are thirteen tribes. Since the same ambassadors mentioned in this decree go also to the court of Philip V. of Macedon (Kern, op. cit., No. 47), this inscription

must be dated after his accession in 221. The only place for a secretary from the deme Erchia (Aigeis) is in 209/8. The name of the archon had 11 or 12 letters

Nikophon and Dionysios (IG. II. 401, II. 5. 623b, 1161b) hold the archonship in successive years as is evident from IG. II. 5. 623b. The prosopographical evidence shows that they should be dated not long before Phanarchides (Kirchner, GGA. 1900, 455). The only possibilities are 208-6 or 205-3. The historical evidence favors the year 205/4-203/2 (Ferguson, *Hellenistic Athens*, p. 256, note). We should probably restore ἐπὶ Νικοφῶντος in IG. II. 5. 385 f.¹ This inscription is dated in the period when there were thirteen tribes as is shown by the arrangement of the prytanies. The deme of the secretary is either κε[φαλῆθεν] or κε[ιριάδης]. The latter belongs to Hippothontis for which the only possibility is 202/1. The archon for this year is Phanarchides, and while his name may be restored in the first line, yet this restoration must be avoided because there were probably only eleven tribes in 202/1 (Von Schoeffer, PW. V. 32, 38 ff.; Tod, BSA. 1902-3, 173 ff.; Ferguson, *Hellenistic Athens*, 268-9). We must therefore restore κε[φαλῆθεν]. The decree may then be dated in 231/0, 218/7, or 205/4. The first two of these are occupied by archons whose names cannot be restored in this decree, which must accordingly be placed in the year 205/4. The restoration ἐπὶ Νικοφῶντος fills the lacuna exactly in line 1, and although Nikophon may be a year later, there is much more in favor of the earlier date (Ferguson, *op. cit.*, p. 256, note 3). Dionysios is dated in the year immediately following Nikophon (IG. II. 5. 623b).

Phanarchides (IG. II. 5. 385c) is dated by Ferguson provisionally in the year 202/1. He held office in the third year of an Olympiad (Homolle, BCH. 1891, 363). The possible dates according to Kolbe are 202/1, 198/7, 194/3. In the archonship of Phanarchides ὁ ταμίης τῶν στρατιωτικῶν defrays the expense while in the following year ὁ ἐπὶ τῇ διοίκησει reappears (IG. II. 392). The latter office existed until 190/89, and it is practically certain that it came into existence again with the reforms following the abolition of Antigonis and Demetrias and the establishment of Attalis. Nor can we place Phanarchides in 198/7, because Proxenides was archon in 197/6, and we know from IG

¹ This is the latest example of στοιχηδόν writing in Attica.

II. 392 that the secretary in the year following Phanarchides was Prokles, while the secretary in Proxenides' year is Euboulos (IG. II. 391). Phanarchides cannot be dated in 193/2 partly because IG. II. 390 is dated in this year, and also because $\delta \epsilon \pi \iota \tau \eta \delta \iota \omicron \iota \kappa \acute{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \iota$ pays for the decree in 193/2. There is no other alternative than to place Phanarchides in 202/1.

The archon succeeding Phanarchides (IG. II. 392) had probably at least 10 letters in his name, and at the most not more than 13 (cf. lines 10 and 16). The name to be restored is plainly one of those not long before 202/1. It is futile to conjecture, since we cannot determine the length of the name accurately and do not know the name of the archon immediately preceding Phanarchides. Kolbe's restoration of Philon is impossible, because it is based upon the length of line in the upper decree on this stone where the spacing is much wider (op. cit., 90. 92). It is tempting to restore $\epsilon \pi \iota \Delta \iota \omicron \nu \nu \sigma \acute{\iota} \omicron \nu$ which fills the space and is a very common name.

Proxenides (IG. II. 391. 393, Wilhelm, UDA. 213 ff.) is assigned to 197/6 because the office of $\delta \epsilon \pi \iota \tau \eta \delta \iota \omicron \iota \kappa \acute{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \iota$ existed in the second century only in the years 201-190. By restoring the deme of the secretary as [$\kappa \delta \rho \epsilon \iota \omicron \varsigma$], which exactly fills the space (cf. Kirchner, Pros. Att., s. v. $\epsilon \upsilon \beta \omicron \upsilon \lambda \omicron \varsigma$), we must date Proxenides by the secretary cycle in 197/6.

For convenience of reference a table is appended giving the dates of the archons between 273/2 and 191/0 in accordance with the results of this study. When a name is printed in italics, the exact date of that archon cannot be determined with the evidence at present at our command.

Year B. C.	Archon.	Deme of Secretary.	Tribe of Secretary.	
273/2	<i>Sosistratos</i>	Kekropis	IX
272/1	Hippothontis	X
271/0	Pytharatos	Aiantis	XI
270/69	(K. 702, 703)	Alopeke	Antiochis	XII
269/8	<i>Philoneos</i>	Antigonis	I
268/7	Philokrates	Melite	Demetrias	II
267/6	Thymochares	Erechtheis	III
266/5	Peithidemos	Aigeis	IV
265/4	Glaukippos	Myrrhinous	Pandionis	V
264/3	Diognetos	Leontis	VI
263/2 <i>ιδης</i>	Akamantis	VII
262/1	Antipatros	Oineis	VIII
	Arrheneides	Antigonis	I

Year B. C.	Archon.	Deme of Secretary.	Tribe of Secretary.	
261/0	Demetrias	II
260/59	Philostratos	Erechtheis	III
259/8	Phanostratos	Aigeis	IV
258/7	Antimachos	Myrrhinous	Pandionis	V
257/6	(K. 704)	Sounion	Leontis	VI
256/5	Akamantis	VII
255/4	Oineis	VIII
254/3	<i>Theophemos</i>	Kekropis	IX
253/2	Diogeiton	Keiriadai	Hippothontis	X
252/1	Olbios	Rhamnous	Aiantis	XI
251/0	K. 774 (II. 5. 371c)	Eitea	Antiochis	XII
250/49	Pheidostratos	Ikaria	Antigonis	I
249/8	Demetrias	II
248/7	Erechtheis	III
247/6	Lysiades	Aigeis	IV
246/5	Hagnias	Myrrhinous	Pandionis	V
245/4	Kleomachos	Kettos	Leontis	VI
244/3	<i>Lykeas</i>	Akamantis	VII
243/2	<i>Polystros</i>	Oineis	VIII
242/1	Heliodoros I	Athmonon	Kekropis	IX
241/0	Athenodoros	Hamaxanteia	Hippothontis	X
240/9	Charikles	Rhamnous	Aiantis	XI
239/8	Lysias	Antiochis	XII
238/7	Kimon	Antigonis	I
237/6	Ekphantos	Hippotomadaï	Demetrias	II
236/5	Lysanias	Euonymon	Erechtheis	III
235/4	Kallimedes	Plotheia	Aigeis	IV
234/3	Alkibiades	Pandionis	V
233/2	Thersilochos	Phrearrhoi	Leontis	VI
232/1	Jason	Ptolemais	VII
231/0	Diomedon	Hagnous	Akamantis	VIII
230/9	... βιος	Epikhephisia	Oineis	IX
229/8	<i>Lysitheides</i>	Kekropis	X
228/7	Leochares	Hippothontis	XI
227/6	Theophilos	Aphidna	Aiantis	XII
226/5	Ergochares	Alopeke	Antiochis	XIII
225/4	Niketes	Antigonis	I
224/3	Antiphilos	Demetrias	II
223/2	Kalli	Erechtheis	III
222/1	Menekrates	Aigeis	IV
221/0	Thrasyphon	Paiania	Pandionis	V
220/9	Kallaischros	Leontis	VI
219/8	Chairephon	Ptolemais	VII
218/7	Heliodoros II	Akamantis	VIII
217/6	Archelaos I	Oineis	IX
216/5	Pantiades	Kekropis	X

Year B. C.	Archon.	Deme of Secretary.	Tribe of Secretary.	
215/4	Diokles	Keiriadai	Hippothontis	XI
214/3	Euphiletos	Aiantis	XII
213/2	Herakleitos	Alopeke	Antiochis	XIII
212/1	<i>Philinos</i>	Antigonis	I
211/0	Aischron	Demetrias	II
210/9	<i>Isokrates</i>	Lamptraí	Erechtheis	III
209/8	Erchia	Aigeis	IV
208/7	Pandionis	V
207/6	Leontis	VI
206/5	Kallistratos	Ptolemais	VII
205/4	Nikophon	Kephale	Akamantis	VIII
204/3	<i>Dionysios</i>	Oineis	IX
203/2	Kekropis	X
202/1	Phanarchides	Hippothontis	XI
201/0	Ptolemais	V
200/199	Akamantis	VI
199/8	Oineis	VII
198/7	Kekropis	VIII
197/6	Proxenides	Kopros	Hippothontis	IX
196/5	Aiantis	X
195/4	Antiochis	XI
194/3	Attalis	XII
193/2	(IG. II. 390)	Kedoi	Erechtheis	I
192/1	Aigeis	II
191/0	Archelaos II	Kydathenaion	Pandionis	III

ALLAN CHESTER JOHNSON.

PRINCETON.

ADDENDUM.

Professor Kirchner's letter concerning Roussel's reading for IG. II. 5. 381b reached me too late to make all the necessary changes in the text of this article. If we accept the new reading, it is much better to date this inscription in 227/6 B. C. and assume that the deme Aphidna was divided between Aiantis and Ptolemais (cf. note 1, p. 391). Since the year 272/1 is thus left open, it is possible to assign to it either Telokles, Sosistratos, Philoneos or . . . λαίος. It is also possible to restore 'Ἀμαξαντεῖς in line 2 of K. 794 (II. 372), p. 406 and to date this inscription either in 273/2 or 272/1 B. C. Since Koehler and Kirchner both place this archon in the second half of the century from the form of the letters in the inscription, the date to which I have assigned it is preferable.